OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF BOOKS
REGISTERED
10 MAR 1910
MADRAS.

THE CRITIC

A Bi-Monthly

Vol. I | **Tuesday, 15th February 1910** | **No. 4**

The Maharaja of Darbhanga has given—we beg pardon donated—Rs. 1,000 to the Hindu Sabha, with whose objects he expresses hearty accord.

***

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. S. T. Shunmugam Pillai has been elected by Tinnevelly and Madura by 103 votes against Mr. K. R. Gurusawmy Iyer's 83.

Now that the Council has its full complement we can see the work of our non-official members.

***

MATTERS MUNICIPAL.

Corporation meeting of the 1st Inst.—Mr. V. Rama Rao wanted the number of *Lady* Sanitary Inspectors with their qualifications, pay and allowances if any and he was informed that there were three *Female* Sanitary Inspectors, on Rs. 50 each with a conveyance allowance of Rs. 15, two of them being diplomaed midwives and certificated nurses were the other a well educated caste Hindu who has undergone a course of studies in the Medical College and has had some practical experience in sick nursing and midwifery.

Mr. Desika Chariar elicited the fact that the drainage when completed would cost more than Rs. 48 lacs which we presume was the original estimate. This information must be very soothing to the rate-payers.

It is a pity that the report of the Engineer on the rolling stock and permanent way of the Madras Electric Tramway Co., has not been submitted yet.

Mr. Sivagnama Mudaliar moved a resolution of which Colonel Formby had given notice about the reform of roads. The mover wanted to convince the public that the Commissioners were not to blame for the bad state of the roads.

It was the contractors who were neglectful in the matter of storing materials in roads and delaying their repairs to the great inconvenience of the public.

His point was that a list of roads should be prepared so that the Commissioners might bring to the notice of the executive the roads which were in a bad condition.

Though there was nothing in Mr. Mudaliar's resolution condemning the 'good' administration' of Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Narayanasawmy Chetty had the unique

honor of opposing it and said that he would not join with the mover of the resolution in condemning Mr. Lloyd's good administration.

This peculiar attitude of Mr. N. Chetty's forced Mr. Lloyd to say something about his administration.

*

The Hon. Mr. Theagaroya Chetty moved that 'the Commissioners place on record their appreciation of the services rendered by Mr. Lloyd during his tenure of office for the last four years'— which resolution was unanimously carried and replied to in suitable terms by Mr. Lloyd.

It would have been in the fitness of things if Mr. Chetty had moved an amendment to insert the word 'high' before appreciation.

***

Monthly meeting of the Trustees of the Victoria Public Hall:—Proposed by Rai Bahadur G. Narayanasawmy Chetty Garu and seconded by Mr. T. Ghansham Sing.

'That the trustees do place on record their high appreciation of the valuable services rendered by Mr. E. S. Lloyd, I. C. S, as Chairman to the Board of Trustees of the Victoria Public Hall.' Carried.

***

HOW TO BECOME A PUBLIC MAN.

'By occasionally addressing a meeting one can become a public man and even a public leader in Madras ...,' Dr. Nair.

This might be an easy way; but every one aspiring to become a public man may not be a good speaker.

So here are some more easy ways:

Advertise yourself in every way and at every opportunity.

If you can write decently send long articles to the daily papers over your full name. If you have any letters of the alphabet to your name do not fail to trot them out. If you cannot yourself write, get an obliging B. A., to do it for you.

If a foreign prince visits your place take a prominent part in his reception. You may by fluke find yourself a Somebody one of these days and that would lead to many other good things.

Get some important selected extracts from the public prints and be sending them regularly to the heads of Provinces and the authorities in England. After three or four years some obliging friend might write to the papers about the silent work that you have been doing.

There are some more easy ways but the above will do just to go on with. Or stay, we will add one more.

Stand for the Legislative Council at the earnest request of your friends and withdraw at the last moment in favor of your more powerful rival; of course it must be in the interests of your District, Presidency or the Empire.

***

THE MADRAS BAR.

THEN

'*Meeting of the Bar*, 14*th March* 1865.

PRESENT.

Messrs. Norton (*Advocate-General*), J. D. Mayne, S. Branson, T. M. Busteed, P. O' Sullivan and J. Miller.

The following, among other, Resolutions were passed :—

1. *Resolved*, that the members of the Bar do not accept Briefs from Vakils of the Court.

2. *Resolved*, that the members of the Bar do not hold Briefs with Vakils of the Court.'

'*Meeting of the Bar*, 16*th. December* 1871.

PRESENT.

Messrs. Mayne (*Acting Advocate-General*), Gould, Branson, O'Sullivan, Miller, Handley, Sloan, Powell and Lutchmipathy Naidoo.

Proposed by Mr. Sloan.

That the members of the Bar should reconsider their former Resolution not to accept instructions on the Original Side of the Court from Vakils.

After some discussion Mr. Sloan withdrew his proposition.'

*

'*Meeting of the Bar 7th October* 1875.

PRESENT.

Messrs. Cunningham (*Advocate-General*), Gould, Tarrant, O'Sullivan, Miller, Handley, Shephard, Shaw and Wilson.

Mr. Nevins Pillay's letter of 30th September 1875, asking if Advocates would have an objection to receive Briefs from Vakils. *Read.*

The meeting is unanimous that no alteration should be made in the existing rule.'

*

AND NOW.

'*Resolution*' of the Bar Association, dated 21st April 1904 :—

"The members of the Bar Association are at liberty to appear on the Original Side of the High Court instructed either by Attorneys or by Vakils."'

***

All of us have by now become acquainted with the correspondence which has passed between His Excellency the Viceroy and the numerous Indian Princes and Chiefs. His Excellency invited the opinion and advice of the Chiefs in the matter of the suppression of the seditious movement and they have communicated to him their views. This is the first time that such a step has been taken by a Viceroy to consult the Indian Chiefs in a matter affecting not only British India but the Native States.

This reminds us of a suggestion which will be found in George Campbell's book, 'India as it may be,' and was made so long ago as 1853. He says :—

'I would propose that some distinction, corresponding to our rank and office of Privy Councillor, should be conferred, in the name of the Crown, on natives of talent and distinction, through the country, both on our own immediate subjects and on the feudatories of the empire. Perhaps among this latter class would be found some of the best advisers regarding our internal administration, because they alone are in a sufficiently independent position to give impartial opinions.........This Privy Council, then, I would not ordinarily assemble as a body, or would do so only for nominal purposes, just like the English Privy Council; but I would give to Privy Councillors the privilege of addressing written memorials to Government on public matters, and would enjoin on the Governor General and Governors to consult by circular, on all subjects on which they may think native opinions desirable, all or a portion of the Privy Councillors, and on special occasions to appoint a time and place of meeting, where all interested in the discussion of a particular measure should be invited, if it so please them, to attend and expound their views......The Governor-General might also summon particular Privy Councillors to particular Cabinet Councils, where their opinions should be recorded, but they should have no votes.'

***

In the Lahore Sedition Case among other documents filed by the Government Advocate, there was one, alleged to be in the handwriting of the accused Purmanand,

which purported to be a plan for distributing India in a queer way. Whoever is responsible for the proposed division seems to have had the idea that poor India should be divided between persons who have had up to now no real connection with India and who could in no sense be termed Indian princes. If the obliging friends who are responsible for the said proposal wanted to divide the land between a Muhammadan and a non-Muhammadan could they not have, when they were about it, pitched upon H. H. the Nizam and Baroda or Kashimir? At least there would then have been some satisfaction that two of our Indian princes would rule us. But the Amir of Kabul is to get the Trans-Indus territory, and the Maharaja of Nepal the rest of India! We must strongly protest against our being handed over, even in thought, to either of these. We are quite comfortable as we are.

***

THE INDIAN PRESS ACT, 1910.

4th February 1910.—Introduction of the New Press Bill in the Viceroy's Council by Sir Herbet Risley.

Ruls of business suspended.

Bill referred to Select Committee (no *Madrasee*) with instructions to report by the 8th Instant.

8th February 1910.—Sir H. Risley presented the Report of the Select Committee (Report signed by all members except Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya who appended a note of dissent and Mr. Gokhale and RaoBahadur Mudholkar signed the Report subject to a joint note of dissent).

The Bill was passed into law, Babu Bhupendra Nath Basu and M. Malaviya dissenting.

Chief amendments.—Maximum amount of security reduced to Rs. 2,000 from Rs. 5,000.

Substitution of the words 'the administration of justice in British India' for the words 'any lawful authority'.

Security may be either in money or its equivalent in Government securities.

*

Chief features.—New press owners and publishers of newspaper should furnish security.

Publication of objectionable matter under the Act entails forfeiture of the security.

Existing presses and newspapers publishing prohibited matter may be called upon by Local Government to deposit security.

New presses and papers will forfeit deposit for publishing prohibited matter and if they wish to continue the press or paper must make fresh declarations and security may be enhanced by the Magistrate.

When offence is repeated heavier penalties are inflicted.

If offence is committed a third time both security and press may be forfeited by order of Government.

Appeal against such forfeiture lies to a special Tribunal of three Judges of the HighCourt which can set aside the order of forfeiture.

All other legal remedies are barred.

***

Messrs. *Gokhale and Mudholkar.*—They assent, though not without great reluctance, to the principle of providing a certain amount of executive control at the initial stages over printing presses. It is a choice between two evils and they accept what they consider the lesser evil of the two.

This Act should not form part of the permanent Statute Book, but remain in force for a limited period only-say three years.

OFFICE 10 MAR 1910 MADRAS.

Magistrate should demand security only when he thinks there are grounds to believe that the press or paper would be used for any of the prohibited purposes.

Annulment of declaration as forfeiture of security must take place only after decision of the High Court.

Pandit *M. M. Malaviya*-(only member who did not sign the report).—More time required for consideration of such an important measure.

Same object might have been gained by amending Criminal Procedure Code.

There should also be provision for applying to the High Court for revision of an order for forfeiture of security.

If Bill is passed it will be a misfortune both for the people and the Government.

Its operation should not be extended to all parts but only where there may be a necessity for it. Duration should be confined to three years.

Sardar *Pertab Singh.*—Supported the Bill and so did the Raja of Kuruppam, but the latter also thought government should not stifle public criticism.

Mr. *Dadabhoy.*—Doubted if the measure would attain its ambitious object and check anarchism.

The *Maharajah of Burdwan.*—Thought the measure protective and not repressive.

Nawab *Syed Mahomed.*—Critisized the details of the measure.

Sir *Vithaldos Thackersay* and Mr. *Abdul Majid* generally supported the Bill.

Mr. *Bhubandra Nath Basu* was unable to support it.

Messrs. *K. N. Ali Khan, Chitnavis, Malik Umar, Hyat Khan, P. C. Lyon, Kennick, S. P. Sinha* and the *Raja of Dighapatia* spoke in support of the measure.

***

SOME ECHOS.

'No act already prohibited is made penal by the proposed Legislation, which shows that the existing law is quite sufficient to meet all the requirements of government. The innovation now sought to be introduced into the law is executive interference with the discharge of its legitimate functions by the Press of the country, and is a gross infringement of the rights of the people living under a well-constituted form of Government.'

The *Hindu.*

'The Provisions of the new Press Bill, we hope will be the last word in Legislation of this character......It is time, and much more than time, that a comprehensive and final measue were passed... ...and it is satisfactory to learn that these (papers with good records) will be exempted, no security being taken except from journals and presses which have already offended....For the present we wish only to welcome the new Bill as embodying a sound principle.'

The *Madras Mail.*

'So for as we could see there is on offence of any kind that would be committed in the press or by means of books pamphlets, leaflets and by other methods, which could not be brought within the scope and operation of the penal provisions of some enactment or other........; and it must be borne in mind that the appeal to the High Court comes in only in case of forfeiture. But between forfeiture and the question of security a newspaper or any similar publication may practically be stamped out of existence by a Local Government.'

The *Madras Standard.*

'It is well calculated to secure the object which the Government of India have in view and which has long ago commended itself to all reasonable men.'

The *Statesman*

'We believe that sound public opinion throughout the country will welcome the Bill.'

The *Englishman.*

'No honest critic need fear the new Legislation . . . In view of recent events, Government would have been guilty of a dereliction of duty if they had failed to take the powers, the very moderate powers, they now propose to take.'

The *Indian Daily News.*

'A new weapon is forged in the armoury of the Government, which will have a disastrous effect upon the liberty of the Press.'

The *Bengalee.*

'It would be seen that in this new Press Bill Government have altogether overlooked the objections of the great Liberal Statesman (Mr. Gladstone) that the control of the Press should not be placed in the hands of the Executive and that there was no need for a special Press Act, when there were Laws to deal with sedition and libels on individual officials.'

The *Amrita Bazar Patrika.*

'The elaborate indictment of the Press by Sir H. Risley, one cannot but think, 'is a condemnation of the Government which has allowed the mischief and the corruption of the public mind to reach such a state as is therein set out.'

The *Pioneer.*

'Every Indian paper will be at the mercy of the Executive Government. We respectfully but earnestly warn Government against the very serious blunder of their proceeding. Let them not alienate the better mind of India; let them realise that force is no remedy; let them not persist in prescribing a remedy which may not reach the disease and may produce evils hitherto unknown.'

The *Leader.*

* * *

The last issue of the *Critic* was on the 1st Instant. The new Press Bill was moved by Sir H. Risley on the 4th instant, the report of the Select Committee was submitted on the 8th instant and the Bill was passed into Law on the same date. Our next issue after the 1st instant is out this day and between these two issues such an important piece of Legislation has been enacted within the short space of four days. No member of Government has satisfactorily explained the unnecessary haste in the matter.

As for ourselves we are unable to say that there was any necessity for the measure. But if the Government thought that such an Act was essential they might as well have allowed the Bill to pass through the usual stages before it was passed into Law. There is not much use now in criticising the Act. We may however be permitted to state (1) that under the new Act a new printer or publisher does not receive even that consideration that is accorded to an accused person for, the accused at least is deemed to be innocent till he is proved guilty and (2) that we may as well give up all hopes of the separation of the Executive and Judicial functions. We would not have hesitated to approve the Act if the Government had (1) made no difference between existing and new presses and papers but demanded security only after the commission of an offence (2) limited the operation for a few years only and (3) allowed application to the High Court from when security is demanded. The Government could have made these three concessions without in any the slightest degree defeating the objects of the Act.

* * *

RELEASE OF THE REPORTERS.

To counteract the feelings which might be caused in our minds by the above Act H. E. the Viceroy had a pleasant surprise in store and that was the announcement

that the Government had decided to release the Deportees now in Jail.

***

HYPNOTISM AND THE ASSASSINS.

'*A. B.*' writes to the *Empire* under the heading 'The Assassins. Are they under hypnotic influence?' to the effect that, in the light of the facts that the last two murders (Jackson and Alum) had been committed by physically miserable specimens, both poor and ill-educated, apparently mentally deficient, displaying the same extraordinary apathy, stoicism and indifference to their fate and both steadfastly refusing to divulge the names of their associates, or give any information whatever, it is within the bounds of possibility that hypnotism is playing an important part in this sanguinary drama. Apparently the suggestion thrown out by '*A. B.*' was before the Jackson murderer expressed his regret that he had killed a good man without cause.

Referring to this hypnotic theory the *Empire* says 'The idea may seem daring and far-fetched, but it seems to account for the most remarkable facts connected with this unprecedented outbreak, and any theory is better than none. Perhaps the authorities may see fit to make a few inquiries along this line.'

If the authorities wish to test this theory we would suggest the name of a Professor from Ceylon who was in Madras some time ago and who to our knowledge has, *solely by hypnotic influence*, made a girl who till then had been living (she was over 10 years) solely on milk to take solid food like any another person. He had only 3 sittings and the sudden change of diet has in no way affected the child's health. Before the said sittings the parents of the girl consulted many doctors in Madras but none of their suggested remedies proved of any avail, and it was just by chance and in great trepidation so to speak, that the Professor's art was tried. Of course in this case the 'subject' was almost a child. How far an adult can be influenced by the Professor can only be learnt by actual experiment.

***

THE "CRITIC" CRITICISED.

A correspondent writes :—

SIR.

I had the pleasure to peruse your article on 'Why India should be loyal to England,' that appeared in your Journal No. 3, Vol I, of 1st February. And while I agree with you in the main, please permit me to point out that a lesson on loyalty is one which Indians do not at all require to be told; because loyalty is as it were, ingrained in their very constitution. Both by historical and natural temperament they are loyal. Their loyalty is so marked, that in being loyal, they have also always been patriotic and it is no easy thing to compel them to be disloyal save and except when their ancient civilization, or for that matter, their religion of which they are rightly proud, is in danger of forced extinction. The loyalty of theirs has certainly not been weakened by the British conquest of India. Sir, in this connection, it seems to me that a very careful study of what may be called the ethics of conquest is absolutely essential to enable any one to come to a right conclusion both as regards the loyalty of the Indians and the conquest of India by the British. But I am afraid, sir, that I have already tresspassed your limits and with your permission I would deal with it in your next issue. (Yes. If you are short—*Ed.*) Speaking frankly, it appears to me that while urging the Indians to be

loyal to the rulers, you have pointed out, perhaps unconsciously, some of the glaring defects and drawbacks in the constitution of the Indian Society, which if remedied, (as you doubtless seem to advise them to do so) will go to make their loyalty a very disagreeable one indeed. (How? *Ed.*) Nor is this all. In dealing with the subject, you have introduced some very controversial points which is highly undesirable. For instance, you say that "no people can ever dream to become independent unless they formed one compact nation......aspirations." Quite true. But does it follow that such a people cannot and ought not to try to lift themselves up in the scale of nations? (No—murders barred. *Ed.*) Division, jealousy, hatred, want of common language and religion, and above all a want of common political aspirations were and are even now the disadvantages that Indians are yet suffering from and I am sure you are not and cannot be ignorant of the fact that some wise Indians realising this, began to work for the removal and complete eradication of these disadvantages and gradually to create common aspirations among them, but those men were immediately done away with.(?) Of course, I blame nobody but the Indians themselves for this unfortimate result, in that, they did not deign to accept and act up to the advice of those wise men; and the result of this apathy or indifference is that they find themselves yet where they were. The desire for improving one's lot is natural enough and is in no way inconsistent with the spirit of loyalty or devotion to the rulers, but if this spirit is to be nipped in the bud no matter by whom, then surely, the fate of such a people is doomed. You say that "commerce and industries have improved by leaps and bounds," I have to admit to a sense of disappointment here. Commerce and industries have improved! In whose hands are these and who are benefited by them? (If the complaint is that Indians are out of it, whose fault is it?—*Ed.*) I am afraid that a free and impartial discussion of this subject, though desirable, will yet plunge us into an abyss from which there can possibly be no escape. As regards the question of the safety of person and property which the Indians now enjoy. I am not in the least disposed to say *No*. to it. But this I may venture to say, that Indians enjoyed them equally well in the old days. And as regards the facilities of communication which the Indians now enjoy, it may be said that these were effected not alone in the interests of the people. (Perhapt not; but the people do enjoy such facilities. *Ed.*) The question of Indians being allowed to hold high appointments in the service of the State, is, I am afraid, still a thorny one. The fitness of the Indians and their capacity to fill high places have been admitted on all hands and especially by the rulers but save and except in the Judicial Department of the service, there does not seem to have been a tendency on the part of the authorities to bestow any high appointment on any Indian, let alone the one or two high appointments that have just now been made by the Secretary of State. There is no dearth of capable, intelligent and highly educated Indian gentlemen to fill high places with credit to themselves, their nation and to the rulers and yet what do we find? The late Mr. R. C. Dutt was not allowed to rise above the grade of a Divisional Commissioner, the Hon'ble Mr. Gupta who ought to have been a Lieutenant-Governor by now has been conveniently shifted to a different sphere. Messrs. Rajagopala Chariar and A C. Banerji have had no room for the display of their talents here. Our Grand old man Dewan Bahadur Raghunatha

Rau had to go to an Indian ruled state for the display of his genius and ability. I have mentioned only a few of the many able and capable Indians of the present day who would be a match and more so to any of our English administrators, if only they were given a chance. I mention these facts not in any complaining spirit, but rather because, facts have to be told however unpleasant they may be. And besides, the days for the mentioning of agreeable (?) facts are being numbered. The late Sir T. Madhava Rau, Sir Salar Jung, Dewans Seshiah Sastri and Rangacharlu, Rama Aiyangar and Purniah, Sir Seshadri Aiyar and a host of other Indians belonging to the older generation are names that are yet remembered by the Indians with pride and glory. But how many of them rose above the grade of a Deputy Collector here ? And if they had not gone over to the Native States, they would have lived and died only as Deputy Collectors. So much as regards the civil service. And what about the military ? Can any one really point to a single instance in which an Indian gentleman has been lifted above the grade of a Subedar Major ? And yet Indians in the army are, if I am not exaggerating, the props and pillars of the empire. But this is a very unpleasant subject and we had better leave it. "Local self-Government and Legislative Councils." These are mere shams and the less we speak of them now, the better. Local self-Government indeed ! If the work of these self-governing bodies consists solely in the collection of taxes and showing an increase of assessment and collection of the same year after year, we had better have none of it. These bodies are given the power of assessing and collecting certain taxes but they cannot spend even a pice out of it for anything which they might consider necessary, without first obtaining sanction therefor. Much less could they spend a pice over and above the allotment nor could they increase or decrease the salaries of their employees. Even in the matter of selecting their employees, their discretion is restricted. Only a few years ago, our city fathers sanctioned a very small increase to the salary of one of the peons attached to their office but the Government promptly struck it off and but for the strong protest made by them, the Government would not have cared to sanction this increase, small as it is. The accounts of these self-governing bodies have to be subjected to a periodical inspection by Government offices and does this not, sir, betray a want a confidence on the part of the Govt. The very rules for the composition and constitution of these bodies are open to objection and as regards the representations they may make or might have made to the authorities, it has been our sad experience that such have been more often brushed aside. Such has indeed been our experience of the much-boasted self governing bodies. "We have freedom of speech and liberty of the press," and yet we dare not give out what we think and no Indian Editor's position is safe who strictly adheres to the principle of espousing popular cause. (not so. *Ed.*) Unfortunately, sir, you have selected a very controversial subject and your handling of the same is not therefore what it onght to be. But let me tell you that to preach lessons on loyalty to a people like the Indians who have been historically known as inoffensive, is an insult to their understanding deliberately offered. Indians from time immemorial, have been accustomed to regard their earthly sovereign as an emblem of the Lord God himself and regarding him in this light, they dare not, they cannot and will not entertain feelings of ill-will towards such a sovereign, however,

ill-disposed (?) that sovereign might be towards them. (What about the bomb thrown at H. E. the Viceroy, that sovereign's representative ? *Ed.*) Sir, "in the whole course of their history which is as old as the world itself, they have never at any time before, shown themselves to be disloyal, nor is there any reason to suppose that they will be disloyal in future. In a lecture delivered by Professor M. Rangachariar on behalf of the then Madras University Union, on the subject of 'Indian Loyal,' so long ago as 1898, he said :—"Even in the midst of the saddest events of the Mutiny, the loyalty of the Indians and the faithfulness of the Sepoy were both found largely available to serve the cause of peace, justice and good Government." Further on in the course of the same lecture he said, "The faithfulness of the sepoy and his proved heroism are both to-day as fully reliable as when Clive commanded him and the blood of the Indian sepoy mingled with that of the British soldier, in the proportion of more than four of the former to one of the latter in quantity has formed the current needed to bind into a strong and massive whole the concrete foundation of British rule in India.................. So then, Indian interests and British interests are as permanently and as indissolubly united as the blood of the sepoy and the soldier have been mingled together on the same side in all the battle fields known to British Indian history. Can anything be stronger and more durable than this bond of blood ? And have not all castes and creeds of India supplied the worthy sepoy to the British Indian "Army ?' And again he says, "Why, as I said we have reasons to be justly proud of the no small share we have had in bringing about the military and moral successes of our British conquest. In this sense is not the British Government our own Government, is not British rule our own rule—a Government and a rule which we have ourselves helped to establish and to foster.?" Sir, I need hardly say that the vast gathering of Indians and a fair number of Europeans too, I may say (and here, I must tell you that the meeting was presided over by no less a person than the Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sir Ralph Benson, who is still adorning our High Court Bench) before whom the Professor delivered his lecture, very loudly cheered and applauded as he went on giving expression to the above, thus showing that they very fully shared his views. Such being the case, can it honestly and truthfully be said that Indians need lessons on loyalty? Why, sir, as I have pointed out, loyalty is a thing that is ingrained in the very nature of the Indians and therefore any attempt on the part of any one however high he may be, to teach such lessons to such a people is sure to be resented. No doubt, we now and again hear some wild vapourings of a microscopically small number of irresponsible men but to condemn the whole nation (who has done so ? *Ed.*) as disloyal because of these vapourings (but when these vapourings materialize into bombs ? *Ed.*) is nothing short of madness. (Gently please—*Ed.*) The law is sufficiently strong to punish such men and the whole Indian nation is prepared to support the authorities and to uphold, nay, even to applaud their action in such instances. Now sir, the very heading of your article—why India should be loyal to England—implies however slightly, that India is disloyal to England. Or, at any rate, it is equivocal; but this is a subject of such vital importance that equivocal expressions should be carefuly avoided and definite pronouncements made. It is a pity that this subject has been chosen (There was no thought of pleasing the correspondent

when the subject was chosen. *Ed.*) by a journal (presumably Indian) particularly at a time when the necessity for it (if indeed, there had been any) has ceased. (Study *our own countryman* S. P. Sinha's speech, if not Sir Herbert's, of the 8th Inst. *Ed.*)

CIVILIZATION.

Picture to yourself the state of man in the so-called nude and primitive times. He must have been an eater of roots and fruits. Before he reached the hunting stage and while he was yet a fruit eater, he must have discovered which plants were edible and useful and which deleterious. This one discovery, if none other, is more than enough to absolve him entirely from rude savagery. It was then that he contrived the bow and the arrow wherewith he fetched his daily meals. In those times, all he needed was food, implements, society of his own kith and kin and perhaps some ornament. He knew a bit of sculpture, a bit of painting and also music. These were all his wants physical and moral. By nature he is physically weak. Some animals are highly favoured with natural weapons. Man on the other hand sorely needed them. Hence, impelled by sheer necessity he invents such implements as the bow, the arrow, the net, the noose and the knife for the purpose of fetching his food and these inventions are not like the invention of the electric fan as though there is no natural breeze. He did not hunt for sport or gain, but was forced to do so by dire necessity. If he cannot get his food, he contrives some means or other for the attainment thereof, like the thirsty crow in the fable. He then learns to capture alive the wild animals by means of his nets and nooses which served to save his labours for a number of days. It is almost a truism that man by nature feels aversion or dislike for work, mental or bodily. Even the hunter with his few wants should have felt keen disgust when he found no game to bag. Somehow he managed to capture alive some beasts of the land and some fowls of the air, and he succeeded in taming and domesticating them. What a marvellous idea! What a precious boon he conferred on his posterity consciously or unconsciously! Yet it is urged by some people that man originally was a depraved being, possessing not a spark of virtue in him.

Parasara the author of Vishnu Purana on the other hand depicts the people of the Krita Yuga or the first age in golden terms and ascribes to them virtue in its perfection; and the view is not inconsistent with that held by the Unitarians. So the first, is the golden age.

The domestication of wild animals necessarily led to the next step in the ladder of civilization, *viz.*, the nomadic stage. The Nomad's constant rovings from place to place in search of grassy and fertile spots for feeding his cattle necessarily made him acquainted with the various species of grass; and this knowledge inevitably led to the discovery of cereals and their naturalization, which necessarily in its turn led to the agricultural stage. The abundance of the harvest leaves a surplus produce; this must be somehow disposed of; but how? for nothing? No coins, hence no money yet; let it be by barter then. Now trade takes its wings, and necessarily leads to the commercial stage in man's life and the invention of coins or money and a host of discoveries and other inventions.

The next step is to what is called the advanced stage with its endless discoveries and inventions and improvements. All the ancient civilizations, after having reached the advanced stage, continued to be stationary for ages together. For-

eign invasions did not affect the ancient civilizations except politically. The barbarian conqueror was spiritually conquered by his civilized subjects. The ruler, in certain cases, became one with the ruled. The Hun and the Goth were Romanized and the Norman Anglicized. The very fact that the ancient civilization continued and still continue stationary without being affected by foreign conque sts, is a sure proof that there was no settled discontent among the people. Each stage creates new whimsical appetites for the so-called comforts and convenience of life as the result of new inventions and improvements, and there is really no end to them. If the tonnage of a 'Dread nought' be 10,000 tons, it must be doubled. The speed of the fastest cruiser is found to be not satisfactory. The height of Eiffel Tower is, after all, not so high as one would desire. In fact, modern civilization reminds us of the olden times when people in their vanity went on building the Tower of Babel.

There is such a thing as satiety in the satisfaction of our physical wants. Food taken to excess nauseates the stomach. But in the satisfaction of our whimsical desires and fancied necessities, is there any such surfeit? This is one kind of evil inevitably resulting from the endless inventions and improvements. You cannot deny to the lower animals contentment or satisfaction. True, they will feel disappointed if they do not succeed in their hunting excursions. But that sort of mental dissatisfaction or mental uneasiness arises more from the physical pain and exhaustion caused by hunger and starvation than from any settled discontent or from any refined notions or sentiments regarding 'merit', 'adequacy of reward' and so forth. You know, how Mr. Allworthy generally frets and fumes over the inadequacy of reward he got and the superabundance of his own merit. You know how Mr. Lovegold, an upstart in trade, managed to accumulate so much yellow heavy metal extracted from the finest auriferous quartz and how he is hated for that very reason by Mr. Makemoney. Besides, you know how all these persons aspire to thrones limited or unlimited, to powers, powers potent or impotent, to estates in tail or in head and to titles real or unreal. At any rate, there is no justification to say that our primitive fathers had any such refined notions or arpirations. They needed no police to preserve property and public peace, for there was always order and peace as long as every man was contented with his lot and possessed almost nothing to call 'mine' or 'thine.' But both ancient and modern civilization no doubt succeeded in teaching the young and the old alike to despise all those persons who have to secure their bread by manual labour. Is it not for this reason from time immemorial, that Sudras, *i.e.*, all sorts of labourers from the farmer to the scavenger, were, and are still looked upon and treated as low-caste creatures whose touch is nothing but pollution?

Civilization also teaches us to degrade whatever is most natural, simply because it is most natural and to glorify to the skies whatever is unnatural and artificial. Paper flowers are slowly supplanting fragrant flowers of the field or garden. What at first served to protect man from cold and inclement weather gradually becomes his ruling passion; and civilization makes it the ruling fashion of the day. We forget the primary purpose for which clothing and architecture were invented. Simplicity and homeliness gradually vanish; pomp and grandeur supply their place consciously or unconsciously.

The following is the account of the Aborigines of the Andamans furnished to me by a friend of mine who saw them and carefully observed their habits in the sixties. They are naked from top to toe—both male and female. They live in groups or society and feed upon a kind of bulbous root which is very nutricious. It is very palatable when it is boiled or roasted. They drink honey freely which is quite abundant in their forests. Every one young and old is dexterous in the use of bows and arrows. They are good swimmers, and eat fish with great relish. They bathe in the sea. If any one is fortunate to shoot a wild boar or some such big eatable animal, he brings it home, roasts it with dried grass and herbs, and a number of them male and female, young and old, draw themselves in a circle round the roasted boar, and make a hearty dinner of it. After the repast is over, they rise and join their hands to form a circle and dance and sing and laugh and are merry in their own way. They make fire by rubbing two sticks together. They break a kind of stone with much skill, and the broken piece serves them for a sharp knife—so sharp that it is capable of shaving their hair. They are afraid of strangers and become suspicious about them. But that state of feeling is quite natural. With all our civilization, we cannot enter some of the foreign countries without a permit or pass. They are not ashamed of their nudity at the sight of a clothed civilized being. At stated seasons, every male allows to bleed himself by his stony knife in some part of his thigh. Such is the simple homely and natural life the Aborigines of the Andamans lead. They have no huts even. When it rains, they take refuge under a big tree or a cave in the rocks. They one and all, male and female, young and old work for their daily bread. In such a state of society naturally, there is no need for church-men; much less for Magistrates, Lord Mayors and Aldermen; still less for doctors and surgeons, for there is no licentiousness and hence no venerial disease or barrenness which is so common to civilized people. They resemble the lower animals in this respect—moderation in their sexual enjoyments at stated seasons. Their one prayer is that they be let alone and not be meddled with by clothed civilization. 'Save us from our civilized friends' is their one cry, pitious enough to break any other heart than the humane one of civilization. But civilization is quite envious of their simple, natural, contented and happy life and seeks to play the part of the old serpent and admonishes the nude hunter and the semi-nude villager thus:—'You, naked fool, your physical wants are but few. There are other blessed wants which you do not know. Don't you be a nude hunter for victuals; but be a well-clad sportsman for pleasure. You are in the dark bottomless pit of ignorance, you have never seen the celestial light of knowledge. Be educated, so that you may come out of that obscure abyss. Learn by rote all the religious, moral and social maxims of life, and also all the lofty altruistic ideas and ideals, so that you may use them freely and readily in meeting an argument, but try your level best to forget them in your practice: this warning is necessary for if you try to apply those maxims and ideals in your every day practice then there will be this danger—that of your being styled a dreamy eccentric fellow.'

Don Quixote.

***

It may not be out of place here, just after what '*Don Quixote*' says about civilization, to give the following extract from Prof. Mahaffy's new book 'What have the Greeks done for modern civilization,'

'THE HAPPINESS OF A SIMPLER AGE.'

'So we, too, with all our Science, with our increase of material knowledge, and our restless running to and fro, may sink into an ugly, tame, joyless conglomeration of societies for whom new discoveries supply hosts of new conveniences, but no return to the happiness and contentment of a simpler age. Our purblind, toothless children may have their congenital defects vamped up by science, and without it we should, indeed, be stranded upon the reefs of despair. But happiness does not lie here.'

'What,' he continues, 'was the remedy adopted by the middle classes [of Greece] to maintain themselves in comfort? an expedient not unknown in this country and for not very dissimilar reasons. It was the limitation of families, the avoidence of the duty and cost of bringing up children, so that Polybius speaks of it as the signal feature of the Greece of his day, the strange barrenness that had come up on the once prolific inhabitants of the land. Could I offer you a clearer proof of the modern character of this civilization?...And it may not be out of place to remind you that even with many differences of age, of place, and of circumstances, the same moral causes that produce decay in one civilization are likely to produce it in another.'

***

ON FAITH.

(BY P. K. P.)

Continued from page 68.

(3) *Authority of tradition.*—There was once a time in the history of mankind when man was indebted entirely to tradition as regards his faith and knowledge. Just as we find in the life of any man that he first begins to speak before he can read or write, even so it is exactly the case with the history of mankind in general. It could have been only step by step that our primitive hunting forefathers had first learnt to tame the wild animals and become shepherds; then it must have taken a considerable period for them to invent the art of ploughing and cultivating the land; they must have taken a further considerable period to invent the letters or the alphabet. Even after the invention of the alphabet a considerable length of time was necessary for making the alphabet and its combinations and permutations to be understood by a considerable portion of mankind. This brings us to the time of our earliest known writers. Until this time there could have been no other means of communicating knowledge than tradition. Even after the advent of our earliest known writers tradition continued to be the sole means of communicating knowledge for a considerable period. Many a physical and moral impossibility is believed and accepted by faith on the authority of tradition. Of course the mind can never accept an impossibility unless it is propped up by hope of reward for its firm acceptance; also there is the terror of unknown, vague and confused ideas of heavy penalties or punishments consequent upon its non-acceptance. We shall more closely examine these mental principles later on that so very largely encourage our prompt faith in impossibilities.

It was only after the invention of the art of printing, that knowledge took its wings and spread over the wide realms of the globe with wonderful and surpassing rapidity, and shook the old faith to its foundation whereby the boon of liberty of thought was conferred upon mankind. But it cannot be said that tradition lost its influence over faith altogether ever since. It is impossible for any man to learn every-

thing by his own knowledge and experience. He must more or less depend upon his fellowmen for some information or another. He must even place implicit faith in their information as regards certain subjects and mould his actions accordingly. Though there are incalculable advantages possessed by man by virtue of traditionary faith, yet tradition acts as a self-willed tyrant in many respects and holds reason and knowledge captive and persecutes and butchers them according to its sweet will and pleasure, propped up by what is vaguely known as public opinion. Tradition essentially acts upon the imagination. The mind feels a sort of awe and even terror when it contemplates about the vast number of our forefathers of time immemorial that had handed down their faith through countless generations to the present generation, and imagines some vague penalties as being necessarily consequent upon any breach of such old faith. To inspire terror some amount of vagueness and confusion of ideas is necessary. If any object or idea is clear or perspicuous, it will at once dispel all doubt and terror. Why is darkness so very terrible, its very sight horrible? It creates all sorts of vague and confused ideas in the mind and makes it to entertain imaginary fears and terrors. It is in this way that most of the ancient myths and fables handed down to us by our earliest forefathers by tradition, exercise a powerful influence over man's faith. If a myth says such and such an author or moral teacher was born of a virgin by the influence of air-god, water-god or fire-god it must be taken as literally true and believed or accepted on the score of tradition.

(4) *Authority of antiquity.*—Everything that is old is curiously fascinating to our imagination, whether it be a stone, building, tree or any animal creature. We take a real interest in the remains and relics of ancient Buddhist, Hindu, Christian, Mahommadan temples, churches and Mosques, the pyramids of Egypt, the fossil plants and animals decayed and imbedded in the rock, the coins of Porus, Alexander and Darius, the gigantic ever-living banyan tree and a host of such other objects existing for ages and centuries. No doubt it is for the sake of knowledge that man explores such ancient relics. But the mind is seized with a sort of surprise or astonishment, awe and a certain amount of veneration or respect for them. The strange blended feeling of awe, surprise and veneration—though not in equal degrees—is even present in the mind of man at the sight of old age. An old man is naturally respected. I have known many a case wherein if a witness happened to be an old man, say past eighty years, the judge at the sight of him made him sit in a chair and even listened to him with more than ordinary interest or attention. And the reason for this regard or respect, may be the Judge's humanity or pity for the weakness of old age. The presumption also that the older a man is, the riper in experience and knowledge will he be, is generally irresistible, and hence he is deemed wiser than his younger species although there may be many an old man possessing no brain beneath his skull and is but a numskull. Was it not on this presumption that people invariably all over the world entrusted all their important affairs touching their society as a whole and its Government, to Senates and Witenagemots? The origin and meaning of the words throw considerable light upon the fact that there was a time when man placed implicit faith in his superior in age merely. Such being human nature, it is natural that man should entertain such a curious blending

of emotions at the thought of antiquity. The more ancient an author had been the more he had wielded his influence in shaping and moulding the thoughts, feelings and the faith of man. In certain cases he will even be fortunate to pass for an infallible being. What he says must be believed for it must be true and cannot be wrong. Among many a people he becomes the god even and his stony image can be seen in a temple specially erected in his honor. Thus many a poet became a *rishi* or *muni*, as many a devoted believer in Christ became an *apostle* or *saint*. An ancient author or any sort of ancient hero has this special advantage over a recent one. An ancient one, from the remoteness of past time or antiquity, had been known and read or his opinions and ideas of things in general and their relation to each other had been handed down by tradition, from father to son, son to grandson, grandson to great-grandson and so on to a great number of generations, till the present age or generation. His sayings and the ideas represented by them consequently had taken a deep hold of man's mind unless they had been exploded long since by the light of knowledge and experience. We must also bear in mind that these ancient poets belonging to any nation whatsoever had essentially contributed to the growth, formation and preservation of their respective language. There was no touch, stone of knowledge and experience, wherewith the rest of ignorant mankind that form the ancient author's audience, could have tested the truth or falsehood of what they had heard by tradition. It is curious to find that religious faith in every nation is based upon the authority of *antiquity* and *tradition*.

Bearing in mind that in the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the Anglo-Saxons were governed by foreign Norman French rulers, that their court language was Norman French, that the fashion of the times was to speak colloquial French, bearing all these facts in mind, I doubt very much whether there would be the language I now write in had there not lived two men in old England in the good old fourteenth century, the one who had preserved the old English language in prose translations of the Bible, and the other in his immortal poetry. When so much can be said of *Chaucer* and *Wycliffe* that have lived only 500 years ago what cannot be said of the hoary and ancient *Valmiki* and *Vyasa*, or the good old *Homer* that preserved and even formed their respective Sanskrit and Greek languages and thus began to rule over man's mind from time immemorial to be counted by thousands of years. Our ancient authors had yet another advantage and that was that knowledge was entirely and exclusively in the possession of only a very few so that the rest were ignorant. Thus the ancient poets having these peculiar advantages had been in fact ruling the minds of men for thousands of years and their authority is made to be felt by tradition. Here too we see that antiquity derives its authority over man's faith from the blended feeling of surprise, awe and respect or veneration ever present in the mind by his contemplation of antiquity.

(*To be continued*).